

Webster be regarded as noble, and fit to stand by the side of him of whom the poet sang that,
 'Satan excepted, none higher sat.'
 But if it requires fidelity to principle, if it requires truthfulness in the heart and goodness in the life, to make a noble man, then by the side of some of the humble and lowly of earth, let Daniel Webster hide his head in obscurity. [Cheers and hisses.]

What is the ground of the charge upon which we arraign Daniel Webster, as our friend has truly called him, as the representative of a large portion of the people of this country? We may, perhaps, by investigating that ground, and taking for granted that Daniel Webster's advocates here know the facts of the case, arrive at some just estimate of his notions of nobility of character. [Applause.]

Daniel Webster has lately come before the nation and the world with the utterance of his sentiments upon certain very important matters. He has come avowing himself ready to support a certain measure of public policy. He has pointed to a certain bill that has been introduced into the Congress of this nation, and avowed himself ready to vote for it in all its provisions, to sustain it to its fullest extent.

The same man who, thirty years ago, stood upon Plymouth Rock, and pointing to the spot of New England which was desecrated by participation in the African slave trade, said, 'Let that spot be purified, or let it cease to be of New England; let it be purified, or let it be set aside from the Christian world; let it be put out of the circle of human sympathies, and let civilized man henceforth have no communion with it;' that Daniel Webster who uttered these sentiments on the Rock of Plymouth, has now come forward to pledge himself to sustain a slave trade every whit as abominable as that African slave trade, the participants in which, according to his declaration, deserved to be shut out from human sympathy and human regard. He has said that he will vote for the bill which has just been denominated the bill of abominations—a bill which imposes a fine of a thousand dollars and an imprisonment of six months upon the man who obeys the voice of his God, to hide the outcast, the command of his God, to feed the hungry and give water to the thirsty.

Let me tell you a case of which I have some direct information from eye-witnesses. A woman and her children came one dark and stormy night to the door of a citizen of Delaware, and knocked for admission. When that door was opened, he who stood there to ask of that woman her business, what could he do? He did what you and I would do. He bade them enter. They entered; they sat at his fire; they slept on his couch; they were sheltered under his roof. And for that he was considered as a criminal, was subjected to a heavy fine which stripped him of his property. Did that man obey or disobey the voice of his God? Would the champion of Daniel Webster have done as that man did or otherwise?

Mr. Sales—If that Union hung on it, I would do anything to save the Union.

Mr. Burleigh—Let what will hang on it, if you were the owner of a habitation, and a woman and her children came in the midst of a wintry storm, and knocked at midnight on your door, would you admit them?

Mr. Sales—If that woman was to plunge the dagger in our hearts for admitting her, I would not do it.

Mr. Burleigh—I understand him to say, that under the existing circumstances (for if they are not the existing circumstances, they are not relative to the question), he would bolt the door.

Mr. Sales—Supposing—

Mr. Burleigh—Supposing the facts as they existed, would you have admitted the woman and children?

A Voice—He would not admit his grandmother.

Mr. Sales—If I knew—

Mr. Burleigh—Knowing what you do know, what would you do?

A Hibernian Voice—He would not admit his own mother.

Mr. Burleigh—My question is answered by his evasions, and not alone by him, but by the hearts of this assembly. And it is answered by this assembly as it would be by this nation. [Cheers.] As much as this nation has been corrupted and depraved by the influence of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, as much as it has been corrupted and depraved by the influence of a pro-slavery government, not even a pro-slavery church and a pro-slavery priesthood can root out of them their duty to assist fugitives. And as I believe in a God, I am confident they never will be able to root it out altogether. You know what you would do in the case supposed; and Daniel Webster says that if you do that good, if you warm them to your fire, if you shelter them under your roof, you shall be sentenced to a fine of a thousand dollars, and an imprisonment for six months.

Is Daniel Webster a noble man? [No, no; 'Yes, yes!'] Is the man who will vote to put you into prison for six months, because you have done an act of humanity—is that man a noble man? [Yes, 'No, No!'] Then, again, that bill of abominations of which I have spoken provides that every postmaster, from the capes of Florida to the farthest corner of Minnesota, from the borders of New Brunswick to the shores of the Rio Grande, that every clerk of a United States Court, and every custom house officer of this United States government, shall be a judge of the last resort, from whose decision there shall be no appeal, of a man's right to the freedom of his intellect and his conscience, of a man's right to his wife and his children, of a man's right to his manhood, and every thing thereunto pertaining. It says that the government which upholds slavery shall appoint the judges who are to administer the pro-slavery law.

Our fathers, in the days of the great struggle with the Stuarts, could say nothing more severe than that they maintained their High Commission Courts, the judges of which were dependent on the King alone. That was sufficient to stir up a rebellion which severed the head of Charles Stuart from his neck, and rolled his body from the bloody block; that was enough to decide the date of dynasties and change the course of nations. And now we are to call that man a noble man, who, with his avowed abhorrence of every form of tyranny, who, with all his solemn pledges to be true to liberty under all circumstances, and in all places, and at all times, regardless of all temptations of interest and all questions of policy, that man, who, in defiance of all these pledges and professions, comes forward to maintain an institution in comparison with which the High Commission Courts of the Charleses and the Jameses are the defenses of liberty. [Prolonged cheers.]

Why, of you is willing to have his right of property submitted to the decision of any postmaster or any clerk of the United States Court, or any Custom House officer, that the party against him may see fit to choose? For it is the complainant who selects him. A man comes here from Georgia to look after William and Ellen Crafts; he comes from Richmond to look after Henry Box Brown; and if the man fears that the *proslavery*, (that is the word that Daniel has in this Webster's dictionary,) [applause.] if he fears that the *proslavery* of Massachusetts will be stronger than his claim, he may come with the postmaster of Richmond, or of Macon, Georgia, or with the clerk of the United States Court in Florida—no matter where he may come from, he may bring him here. He chooses the tribunal to try whether his brother man shall be recognised henceforward as a man, shall enjoy the rights and participate in the privileges of a man, or whether he shall be driven to unrequited toil. Are you prepared to say this is a just law? Will my friend answer that question as explicitly as he did the other? [Laughter.] Are you prepared to say that a provision by which a man's right to liberty is subjected to the fiat of an insignificant postmaster of the South—that such a provision would be just?

Mr. Sales—The postmasters obey the law.

Mr. Burleigh—But is it a just law?

Mr. Sales—I believe that is not the law.

Mr. Burleigh—Suppose it is the law.

Mr. Sales—I cannot suppose it.

Mr. Burleigh—Our friend could make suppositions as plenty as blackberries a little while ago. [Much laughter.]

Mr. Sales—That is a mere personal attack.

Mr. Burleigh—Here, then, is the ground upon which we charge Daniel Webster, in common with others, (Daniel Webster, as the representative of a class which, thank Heaven! is growing smaller and smaller every day)—[cheers and hisses]—and, under Heaven, we cannot but thank the abolitionists for that. We arraign Daniel Webster and his retainers as 'traitors to humanity,—the traitors most accursed.' We say that they are robbing man of his rights. We say that they are robbing God's image of its dignity. We say that they are robbing liberty and life of their safeguards. And what heightens the iniquity, they are doing it in defiance of their pledges. They can not advance a hair's-breadth without advancing over their own solemnly uttered sentiments. Now, what is that? I do not care for the use of terms. You may name it what you will. You may call it hypocrisy, because these men pledged themselves to a different practice; or, to excuse them from hypocrisy, you may say that they don't believe any thing different, and don't profess any thing different; then you make them the open advocates of the most horrible of abominations.

I wish to say a word about an observation that has been made here by the defender of Mr. Webster, and prefaced by an 'if.' 'If the Union,' we have been told, 'is to be endangered by that law of Christianity which calls upon us to shelter the wanderer—if the Union of these States is to be endangered by our daring to follow the example of the apostles, who said, when they were opposed, "Whether it is right to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye," then we will obey the law, and stand by the Union of the States.' Then, I say unto you, in the words of the ancient Hebrew, 'Choose ye whom ye will serve; as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.' [Applause.]

If you choose to set up this idol god for yourselves; if you choose to take a piece of bloody parchment, tied with red tape, and setting it up on end, to worship it, and exclaim, 'These be thy gods, O American Israel! which brought thee up out of the house of British bondage,' and exact of us to bow the knee and bend the neck before it, why, all we say is, worship your idol gods, and much good may it do you; but as for us, when the question comes between the Union and duty to our consciences, we say, down with your Constitution, for the sake of God and humanity. [Applause and hisses.]

I thank you for that testimony,—[to Mr. Sales, who hissed.] When I said that, our friend greeted it with a hiss. He means to say, then, down with humanity for the sake of the Union! But I say, trample under foot that covenant with Hell, that agreement with Death. I say, down with the blood-stained flag of our Union, which waves over slaves and slaveholders! I say, let us be true to Him who teaches us the brotherhood of the race, and requires of us that we love our neighbors as ourselves, and 'do unto others as we would have others do unto us.' [Applause.]

Man is more than Constitutions; better not beneath the sod. Than be true to Church and State while we are doubly false to God.' [Applause.]

The Constitution tells me to give back the runaway slave to his master. Well, the Constitutions of other countries have required other atrocious acts; and those who have refused to obey them have been called heroes and martyrs. What, then, is he who refuses to obey this Constitution? Call him what you will, you give the name to me.

I say, if the Constitution calls upon you or me to give up the slave, every true lover of humanity is bound to refuse it obedience, and is bound to go on persevering in obedience to the higher law. I know that there are those who sneer at the idea that there is a higher law than the Constitution. But we can bide our time. Men may sneer at the superiority of sunshine to their smoky lamps, when there is only a dim light before morning; but let them wait until the clear, broad sun of day shines through the morning mists and penetrates the recesses of the earth, and then who will undertake to sneer at the god of day?

Who made the Constitution of the United States? 'We, the people.' Can we make right and wrong? Can we create the eternal distinctions which separate virtue from vice? If we can, then the Constitution which the people made is binding, let what may contravene it. But if not, and if we are not rank atheists; if we believe that there is a principle which is the foundation of justice, then your Constitutions are but the chaff of the summer threshing-floor when they oppose it. No! We deny the power of the people to create right. We deny the power of the people to change the moral essence of things. And denying that, we must appeal to a higher power.

But, they say, there is your pledge in the Constitution to return fugitive slaves.

Mr. Mellen—Daniel Webster says no such thing. He says the Democrats have done wrong about Texas, and now we will take advantage of that wrong, and will therefore go for the admission of four more slave States. He says the country has never agreed to return the runaway slave, and that therefore he will take advantage of the wrong already accomplished, will return the fugitive slave, and thus make slavery perpetual in this country.

Mr. Burleigh—Our friend Mellen wishes to make out Daniel a worse man than I do—and that there is no need of. [Laughter.] Daniel says that the Constitution already agrees to return the runaway slave—

Mr. Mellen—No, he does not say that.

Mr. Burleigh—And he says that the Constitution makes it the duty of every citizen to turn kidnapper. That is his opinion of what the Constitution really means. He would make it obligatory on the States, as States, and upon every citizen of the State, as a citizen of the State, to return fugitives. That is the charge which we bring against Daniel, that he is, in the first place, for sustaining that iniquitous—

Mr. Mellen—I wish to explain.

Mr. Burleigh—I wanted to examine just now the position of Daniel Webster under the Constitution. I think he has gone beyond the Constitution. I think he has gratuitously sinned in this matter. I think it will be paid. [Laughter.] I think he has gratuitously sinned in this matter of returning fugitive slaves. What is the ground upon which we are required to give back the fugitive slave? The making of the postmasters and custom-house officers judges in the case is what the Constitution does not require. It is giving more than is stipulated for. But the giving up of the runaway slave is what the Constitution has called upon us to do. Now, those who have sworn and still swear to support this Constitution, let them dispose of Daniel's argument as they may; but for those who declare that they have neither obeyed nor promised to obey this, let them take their ground; and they can take it clearly and strongly, above all these considerations. And we ask of Daniel, 'Is that a reason why a man should persevere in doing wrong, because he has promised to do it? You tell us it is bad morality to break this promise. Does your morality require that you should keep every promise, good, bad and indifferent, you ever made, at all times? We used to be taught that it was better to break a wrong promise than to keep it. And if Daniel does not read the Bible, perhaps his play books might have taught him better. In some of his old readings of Shakespeare, he might have found that,

'It is a sin to swear unto a sin,
 But greater sin to keep the sinful oath.'

That is our faith. Why, the oath comes to this: I solemnly swear, in the name of the Most High, that I will trample upon the law of the Most High; and I pray that God will so help me, as I shall defy him and outrage his commandments. What do you think of such an oath as that? Is it morally binding? Yet that is the oath which Daniel Webster points you to, when he tells you it is bad morality to shelter the fugitive slave, and harbor refugees from bondage, whom you have sworn to give up. Yet, Daniel is great at harboring refugees. He made a speech for the Hungarians. He believes in making this country the asylum for the oppressed of all lands, except those of our own. He believes in assisting and harboring the Italian patriots, the Hungarian patriots, the Grecian patriots, the Polish, the German, the Swiss patriots, and all the patriots in the world, this side or the other side of the Chinese wall; only when you reach this country, if you find any body who is injured, who is harried among brutes, he will return him to his oppressor. If Kossuth comes here, we will welcome him; but if Ellen Crafts comes, we will send her back. If Mazzini comes, we will bestow on him the hospitality of the country; but if Henry Box Brown—a person who demands the admiration of the world for his heroic achievement to win freedom—if he should come, we will nail him into a worse box than he was ever in before. [Shame, shame!]

And we are reminded that Daniel Webster is the representative of a class. Truly, he is, and that is their position; and these are the men whom we are called upon to recognize as bearing the broad imprint of Heaven's signet of nobility! Heaven save me from the withering touch of that sort of a signet! [Hear, hear.] Judge ye whether the allegation of these resolutions is sustained by the facts of the case. Judge ye what sort of a nobility it is that can demean itself and ally itself to the trampling upon the down-trodden; and judge ye whether those who will do this will acquire a patent of nobility from Him who said, 'For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him.'

SPEECH OF JAMES W. WALKER OF OHIO.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I have no doubt at all that numbers who attend our Anti-Slavery Conventions join in the observation frequently made outside of our meetings, that we deal very much in vituperation, and that almost all our resolutions, and our language in support of those resolutions, are unnecessarily severe. The language attributed to Daniel O'Connell, the language adopted by every friend of the slave in this country, has been many looked upon as unwarrantable in its character. They think that Daniel O'Connell, situated as he was, surrounded by the influences he was, at such a distance from our country, must have been entirely unqualified to give a just exhibit of the case, or to form a rational conclusion thereon. It has struck my mind that persons should be placed in similar circumstances in which the individual alluded to was placed, to form a just conception of the crimes perpetrated in the name of Liberty, and of the vices of those individuals who pride themselves in their Christian character.

Most certainly, the individual whose works are connected with deeds of blood is not the one whose testimony is to be received in favor of such individuals as have been associated with him. It must be the individual whose heart is unstained, who has just conceptions of right and wrong, and who is able to determine, as an impartial spectator, who can be the faithful judge. And I hold that the abolitionists of America, and the friends of freedom the wide world over, are the persons alone qualified to determine the character of slavery. We stand outside,—if I may be allowed to use such an expression,—we stand outside of the influences which crush and degrade and almost brutalize entirely the souls of the slaveholder and his confederates; and standing outside of that influence, are prepared to give a just decision in reference to the moral quality of the deeds that they from time to time are engaged in. And I am sure, that if an individual will only analyze the character of the slaveholder, and look at the atrocities connected with this infernal system of wrong, he will be brought to the same conclusion as was Daniel O'Connell, and be prepared to admit the truth of the language of the venerable Wesley, that slavery is the sum of all villainies.

In many of our large gatherings like the present, we are too apt to forget the character of the slaveholder with whom we have to do. In fact, the public sentiment of the people of the United States is the very reverse of that which Daniel O'Connell presented to our consideration, and that which the American Anti-Slavery Society and the abolitionists generally have adopted. So far from recognizing the slaveholders as the most atrocious of mankind, they regard such individuals everywhere as being the most noble, the most chivalrous, the most pious, and the most democratic of the whole people; and so terribly have we fallen in our conceptions of righteousness and purity and truth, so far have we become debased by the influences of American despotism, that a man must assume a despot to qualify himself for high standing in society anywhere in our country. And individuals who stand with Daniel O'Connell on the anti-slavery platform, who avow their abhorrence of slavery, their hatred of that which tends to brutalize the race, they are the persons treated with scorn, they are the persons charged with every degree of crime imaginable, they are the traitors in the eye in which they live; while the man whose soul is steeped in infamy and crime is the man whom the people delight to honor! When such individuals come among us in Ohio, or assemble even here, a kind of holy awe seems to pervade the people, and they bow in reverence to the Slave Power, until in fact we view slaveholding as perfectly in harmony with the highest conceptions of justice and purity and right.

It is not necessary to analyze the particular proceedings of religious bodies, to ascertain that this is the great feeling that controls them in all their movements. It is enough to look at the aggregate influence growing out of our religious and political organizations and parties, as such. It is enough for us to look abroad and discover what the fruits of the public sentiment, embodied in religious and political organizations, are, to see that their sentiments are entirely subversive of the great principles of human freedom, and that all their influence is thrown on the side of the Slave Power everywhere.

There is one fact which, it seems to me, must strike all who attend these meetings, and that is, the boldness with which the sentiments put forth are uttered. When we come upon the anti-slavery platform, we come not as individuals who attend the popular conventions in Boston and other cities—we come not to build up an organization, to save an institution, to establish a theological opinion on some point of theology, but we come to protect and defend humanity, which we deem to be above, beyond and before every appendage to humanity in the form of organizations and institutions. And when we speak upon this subject, I mean the true abolitionist everywhere, when he speaks upon this subject, he speaks for man directly. He has nothing but man to save, nothing but truth to vindicate, nothing but error to expose. And here we stand, undoubtedly, in a position almost peculiar to ourselves; for when the popular orators who address the nation, stand before public audiences, they have not chiefly man to defend, but they have institutions and laws and governments and organizations, which in their estimation generally are more sacred than man himself. And when they would speak in bold words in favor of human rights, every now and then they fear that this blow or that may strike

dead some favorite dogma or institution, and they therefore hold back the sentiments their heart would utter, and deal in honeyed words and softened accents, that they may not injure those institutions to which they are attached. Not so with us. We are here to save man from thralldom and bondage. We are here to rescue the millions who have fallen among thieves, and raise them to their true position. And the question is not, will the sentiment we shall utter militate against any organizations in Church or State. Whether it will cause their downfall or not, that is not the question with us; but it is, will it tend to secure personal liberty for man? And I am sure, at this stage of the anti-slavery enterprise, it is well to keep these distinctions in mind, that our object is to save man.

I know there are thousands who would gladly co-operate with us in our work of changing public sentiment, and in redeeming that portion of humanity who are in bonds. But they say they cannot go with us, because they are afraid our influence will militate against 'our church,' or 'our party,' and that by that procedure will separate those bonds that bind the States together, and produce universal anarchy. Much as I regard the individuals who are placed in the position to which I have alluded, yet it seems to me that they have far too low an estimate of human liberty, when they will refuse to act in harmony with us for the redemption of the race, for fear some more appendage to the race shall have its corner-stone knocked out, or something that has been held venerable in time that are gone by, shall cease to be venerable in the future. I do not know that the abolitionists have less veneration than the masses of the people; but one thing is certain—they venerate man; and if they have any veneration to spare for mere institutions and organizations, it must come in as secondary, and never claim a primal position in their movements and in their hearts. [Cheers.]

The sentiment has been iterated and reiterated again and again, that slavery is the sum of all villainies. And it seems to me that unless our intellectual faculties were very much clouded by a false theology and religion, it would require no argument to prove that position; it would carry conviction to the mind of every man. And undoubtedly it does, in the case of each individual, when he brings it home to himself. But that which is deemed virtuous and good, when applied to ourselves, or to the German or Italian or Hungarian abroad, when applied to our slaves in our own midst becomes treason in the estimation of the people, and must be put down at every possible hazard. It is strange how much we boast of freedom. Everybody knows that the love of liberty has a lodgment in the hearts of the people. Yet when we demand its application to the particular class to which I have alluded, it certainly becomes, to a considerable extent, vapor, thin air.

We welcome to our shores the refugees from other lands, we open wide the portals for all to enjoy our republican institutions. When we hear of the masses of the old world rising in the strength of their manhood, and by the force of their own right hands striking down the despot, causing thrones to tumble, a thrill of sacred emotion seems to run through the hearts of the whole people, and every where we hail with transports of joy the news that another throne has fallen, and that another despot is crushed. And if the attempts of others shall fail of successful issue, we welcome them to our midst; and when they come, we introduce them to the highest society (that is, to the slaveholders, of course), to the highest society and the highest places in the nation. And everywhere they are lauded, and everywhere their praises are rung in view of their manliness. But when the condition of individuals subjected to a greater degree of degradation than all the nations of Europe combined are subjected to, comes upon the carpet for discussion,—when we stand forth for their interests and their manhood,—as a matter of course, the Church and the State combine, Pilate and Herod strike hands to brand such an unworthy of the name of the country in which they live!

It is high time that this state of things were altered. It is high time—however loud the declamations of the church, however determined the abettors of the slave,—it is high time that we, laying aside all idea of mere caste or complexion, should vindicate the right of all mankind to their manhood, and applying those principles to the slave, rush forward till every fetter be broken off, and every bondman be redeemed. [Prolonged applause.] As Mr. Burleigh well said this morning, there is a love of liberty in the breasts of the people, and when it comes to the great issue, their consciences, especially on a subject like that of returning fugitive slaves, will be on the side of freedom, and not on the side of the oppressor.

I do not for a moment suppose, neither do the abolitionists generally, that all the anti-slavery sentiment of this nation is found among the ranks of the American Anti-Slavery Society. There is anti-slavery sentiment every where. There is anti-slavery feeling operating throughout the whole lump of the nation, and manifesting itself in a thousand different forms. In fact, those who are known as members of the American Anti-Slavery Society with us in the West, are sometimes, by even politicians themselves, looked upon as being rather defective in their anti-slavery protestations, especially when there is to be an election! If there is a district in which there is a considerable anti-slavery sentiment, Whigs, Democrats and Free Soilers all try to go beyond even the come-outers, as we are sometimes called, in condemning the public villany of slavery! A Mason's bill in our part of the country must necessarily be rendered null and void; for in meetings composed of all political parties, immediately after the speech of Mr. Webster, immediately after the intelligence of his apostasy was received, the most decided opposition was manifested to the idea of returning the fugitive slave. Whigs, and Democrats, and Free Soilers seemed to vie with each other to put the brand of condemnation upon that proposition, vowing, by the living God, that as the slaveholder had determined to make advances upon them, they would advance upon slavery.

When Webster's speech was referred to with us, the most stringent resolutions were passed, resolving that as the slaveholders had made fresh demands upon us, we would no longer satisfy ourselves with siding the fugitive to Canada; we would no longer satisfy ourselves with putting him in the hands of Mr. Wilson, at Dawn, but that we would identify ourselves with him, [applause,] and throw around him the same influences and the same protection that we would throw around our own wives and children, were they attempted to be stolen from us. [Prolonged applause.]

This, it seems to me, is the true ground to be taken. When the time comes for new sacrifices, we ought to let our position be known, by taking a new step towards the achievement of universal right, and bring the issue to as small a compass as we possibly can. For I am confident that, when the direct issue shall be made, notwithstanding the terrible influences brought to bear upon them, the people's hearts will speak for liberty; and the man who pursues the bondman, with the intention of dragging him back to the worst, at least, of my ideas of hell, he could no more take him back than he could draw God from his throne. [Loud cheers.]

I am glad, since I have been in New England, that I have had the pleasure of mixing with New England abolitionists, and of addressing Massachusetts audiences. I am rejoiced that I find every pulsation of the abolitionists here beating in harmony with the pulsations of abolitionists in the West. And I can tell the gentlemen who manifested their sympathy with Webster here this morning, that there is an unity of sympathy between the abolitionists of the country more powerful than all the bonds that unite

these States in a single government. It is not a union of freedom and slavery, not a union of despots and freemen, but a union of true hearts for the redemption of the millions in bonds. [Applause.] And our union is brought right alongside into direct conflict with your union; and it will be time for us to determine which of these unions will live for ever, when your union has passed away and is forgotten, so far, at least, as its practical effects are concerned. You know, and we all know, that the Union of these States has been a curse. [Hisses.] Ay, a curse, from the beginning. [Applause and hisses.] It has constantly tended to present us to the gaze of the entire world as mere hypocrites and dissemblers. It has perverted our own conceptions of right; it has tended to subvert the natural impulses of our hearts, and to corrupt the minds of our youth. It has given the most terrible bias to religion, until whatever is good has to live by suffrage at the hands of the American people.

A Voice—It was a compromise.

Mr. Walker—Our friend suggests that it was a compromise. I would here remark, that so terribly have the minds of the people become perverted, that even the church feels itself under obligation to aid and abet Mr. Webster in the preservation of the Union. It was perfectly laughable to read a debate in the Presbyterian Assembly, a few days since. One of the ministers, feeling that a kind of moral earthquake was shaking the Union, proposed that the church take immediate measures to present a memorial to the members of Congress, as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, praying them to do all they can to preserve the Union. Just think of it! Some of them thought that was a political measure, and that members had nothing to do with political questions—(except to vote for Taylor!) I think the best of the reasons assigned was this, that if they attempted to discuss that question, 'it would open the door,' (said one of the doctors of divinity,) 'for a discussion that would be very unpleasant in its character and very injurious in its tendencies. For it has taken all the skill, and all the wisdom, and all the piety of the General Assembly to keep out this agitating question in years gone by. We ought to take a lesson from the Methodist and Baptist churches; let them do, and we had better keep the whole thing out of the church. If we discuss it at all, it will divide us.' So that the Union of the States must not be asked for, lest the dissolution of the church take place. A pro-slavery church is dissolving every where, and the idea of slavery seems to be dissolving from the minds of the ministers themselves.

It was perhaps two or three months ago that I held a series of meetings in one of our towns in Ohio, and while the notice was circulated about the town, the Methodist minister of the place preached one of those warning sermons, cautioning the people not to be led astray by these 'fanatical abolitionists.' The people came out, however, in crowds. We continued our meetings for a long time, and the whole village seemed to be very much brought over to our views and mode of operation on this question. In six weeks after, this minister returned again to the village, and found that the tide of sentiment had changed. He then preached another sermon, of a very different character from the one first alluded to. It was one of the most virulent sermons ever preached against slavery. Towards the close of it, he turned round to his church members, and said, 'You need not leave the church to become a come-outer. I am a come-outer myself.'

If you could see some of those Western Reserve papers, containing the resolutions of some of the churches of that neighborhood, you would see those churches resolving that they are abolitionists. They seem to think the people will not believe them, unless they resolve again and again; and some of the churches have gone so far as to say that they will not fellowship with a slaveholder, nor with the man who fellowships with him; carrying their opposition to three or four generations, to satisfy the people that they are anti-slavery. And I thank God for this; that the public sentiment of the people outside of the church, awakened by the abolitionists, is such as to drive the churches, whatever may be their true feelings, to take their positions and make these professions. Were it not for these resolutions, the churches would become absolutely dissolved. The people would fly from them as from a sinking vessel, looking to the abolitionists as to the ark in which they might be secure. Although the people cannot see through the veil which is thrown over these churches, yet if we, the abolitionists of the West, and you here are faithful to your professions, certain it is that whether the people join our ranks directly or not, the day is not far distant when all union between the North and the South, so far as the levying of troops and the recapture of fugitive slaves are concerned, will be abolished. And how many are there now, who swear to support the Constitution, but will not help the slaveholder in recapturing his slave, or assist in putting down slave insurrections! [Cheers.]

I rejoice that, while the charge of infidelity is hurled at us, we, at least, demonstrate our adherence to the great principles of Christianity, by undoing the heavy burdens, and rescuing our brother man every where; and I pray God that the time may come when the only idea in this land may be, the idea of humanity, of love, of universal kindness. [Applause.]

NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

This Convention assembled in the Melodeon, Tuesday forenoon, and at 10 o'clock was called to order by Francis Jackson.

Messrs. Samuel May, Jr., of Boston, William Jenkins, of Andover, Samuel Dyer, of Abington, Jonathan Walker, of Plymouth, and Daniel S. Whitney, of Beverly, were appointed a committee to report a list of officers.

The committee reported the following list:

President—FRANCIS JACKSON, of Boston.

Vice Presidents—Edmund Quincy, Adin Ballou, of Milford, James W. Walker, of Ohio, George Doughty, of New York, and Bourne Spooner.

Secretaries—Samuel May, Jr., Elbridge Sprague, of Abington, and Eliza J. Kenney, of Salem.

Committee of Business—W. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Anne Warren Weston, Parker Pillsbury, Henry C. Wright, Stephen S. Foster, Abby Kelley Foster, and Lucy Stone.

Committee on Finance—Samuel Brooke, Lewis Ford, Nathaniel B. Spooner, Joshua T. Everett; with power to add to their number.

Opportunity for prayer was given.

While the Business Committee were preparing to report,

Rev. HIRSH WILSON, of Dawn, Canada West, made a brief statement of the condition of the fugitive slaves in Canada, of whom, he said, there were not less than 20,000. As is to be expected of men and women subjected all their lives to the degrading and imbruiting influences of slavery, some are found to be indolent, and even vicious; but a very large number are respectable and worthy people, given to industry, sustaining schools for their children, and maintaining their families comfortably.

The Business Committee reported ten resolutions:

1. Resolved, (in the language of Daniel O'Connell,) That, 'of all men living, an American citizen who is the owner of slaves is the most despicable; he is a political hypocrite of the very worst description.'

2. Resolved, (in the language of Lord Brougham,) That, 'while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they will reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasy, that man can hold property in man.'

3. Resolved, (in the language of John Webster,) That 'slavery is the sum of all villainies, and American slavery the vilest that ever saw the sun.'

4. Resolved, (in the language of the Rev. Albert Barnes,) That 'there is no power out of the church that could sustain slavery an hour, if it were not sustained in it.'

5. Resolved, That the criminality of the abolitionists consists, not in the severity, but in the justice of their language; not in the faleness, but in the truthfulness of their accusations; not in the unreasonableness, but the purity of their principles; not in the rashness, but the wise adaptation of their measures to the glorious end they have in view; and they are hated, persecuted and traduced, solely because they plead for justice to a despised and persecuted race; because they will not compromise with sin, nor go with the multitude to do evil; because they maintain that whatever arrays itself against human liberty is not of God; and because they declare that a religion which is stained with pollution and blood, though called by the name of Christ, is to be repudiated with indignation and abhorrence.

6. Resolved, That he who professes to admire the Declaration of Independence, and to revere the memories of its signers, and at the same time appeals to the Bible, as the inspired word of God, in support of the rectitude of enslaving human beings, proves himself as unprincipled as the highwayman who pretends to regard honesty as of paramount obligation.

7. Resolved, That they who reproach the abolitionist for not so speaking against an all-pervading, all-powerful national sin, as to give no offence; for not so contending with atrocious tyranny as not to excite the displeasure of the tyrant; for not so managing their cause as to create no alarm and cause no agitation; for not so making their accusations and uttering their rebukes as to avoid all personal imputations; for not so consulting a prudent and judicious policy, as to avoid all misrepresentation, reproach and persecution, do exhibit great ignorance, folly and assurance, in requiring what is a moral impossibility, and pour contempt on the memories of the prophets of Christ and his apostles, of reformers and martyrs in all ages of the world.

8. Resolved, That while the general community may naturally view the recent conduct of Daniel Webster with profound sadness and profound surprise, since the opportunity which the slaves of this country ever before enjoyed, and the good which was bold word from his lips, in behalf of justice and humanity, would have done is incalculable; still,

From motion of W. Phillips, that the Convention should take up the question of plans and funds for the coming year.

Mr. May, Jr. offered the following resolution:—

Resolved, That this Convention recommend to the Massachusetts A. S. Society the holding of a Convention in the New England States, for the purpose of agitating the question of the right to the particular phases of the duty of the slave, and especially with regard to the rendition of fugitive slaves, and that it now proceed to take up the resolutions and pledges for the support of the same.

Mr. May, Jr. spoke in its support.

W. L. Garrison rebuked the reporters for the wrongs for the caricatures and false reports given by them of the Convention.

Adjourned.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

Met at 1-4 before 8, according to adjournment; the President in the chair.

Mr. Abbott, reporter for the New York Herald, made a brief statement, in consequence of what had been said of him by Mr. May, in the morning. His statement did not change the aspect of the matter, in any material particular.

Mr. B. H. H. Parker, addressed the Convention. In the course of his remarks, he referred to the gross misrepresentation of the Convention given by the newspapers for many of the city papers.

Mr. Parker addressed the Convention, in a speech of much ability. It made a deep impression upon the Convention.

Heard C. Wadsworth, with consent of Business Committee, introduced the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That it is the right of the slave to escape from slavery, and his duty to do so whenever he thinks he can succeed in the effort.

2. Resolved, That the taking, by the flying slave, of any article of property necessary for his escape from bondage is justifiable, since slavery is but a corrupted state of war, and all nations have recognized the right when either party uses it in self-defense; and no one can be held liable as a thief, a war of individual on individual, even individual property, becomes liable; and further, in defending oneself against a nation banded to enslave you, every weapon you can reach from your enemy's hand is lawful to use.

3. That we hereby pledge ourselves to the slaves, to the children, and the abettors of slavery, North and South, that we will exert ourselves to induce the slave to escape from his masters, and whenever they come among us, will welcome them to an enjoyment of all the industrial, intellectual, social, political and civil rights and privileges which we ourselves enjoy, and that we will trample on all constitutions, all laws, and all precepts and commands, that require the maintenance of fugitive slaves; and that, should Congress be so regardless of justice and the rights of man as to pass any law forbidding us to harbor fugitive slaves, and requiring us to aid the slaveholder or the United States Marshal in returning such fugitives, we will oppose the execution of such laws, and do what we can to make them null and void.

The discussion on the resolutions was continued by Stephen S. Foster, mainly with reference to the course which the churches and pulpits of the land had pursued towards the anti-slavery cause. He paid a warm tribute of respect to Theodore Parker.

Adjourned, to meet in Cohasset Hall, at 1-4 to 8 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

Met according to adjournment, at Cohasset Hall, which was again crowded full. Edmund Quincy, one of the Vice Presidents, in the chair.

The resolutions being read, the meeting was addressed by Charles C. Burleigh, Parker Pillsbury, and Wendell Phillips.

Repeatedly, during the day and evening, endeavors were made to disturb, insult, and break up the Convention, but without success.

Adjourned, to meet in the Melodeon on Thursday, at 10 o'clock.

THURSDAY.

Convention called to order at 10 o'clock; Edmund Quincy in the chair.

Before any business was brought before the Convention, Mr. Homer attempted to speak, and for some time insisted on his right to do so, on a matter of police arrangement. He was told he would not be allowed to go on, without leave of the Convention; to which he assented, and was decided, with but one dissenting vote, to be out of order; and then took his seat.

The Secretary read the resolutions before the Convention.

Rev. JOHN L. RUSSELL of Hingham spoke, and welcomed the Abolitionists as true laborers, in building up the true Church of the Son of God.

ROBERT EDWARDS, a Scotch gentleman, who, for the crime of teaching some slaves in South Carolina to read, had been tarred and feathered in that State, gave an account of his experiences of the institution of slavery, and in his subsequent efforts against it. Though poor, he thanked God, he said, that his hands were in no wise stained with money wrong from the oppression of the slave.

Mr. GARRISON, from the Business Committee, reported the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That if the Bible sanctions slavery, and is thus opposed to the self-evident truth that 'all men are created equal,' and have an inalienable right to liberty,' the Bible is a self-evident falsehood, and ought to be, and will be long be, regarded as the enemy of Nature and Nature's God, and of the progress of the human race in liberty, justice and goodness.

2. Resolved, That they who have to run to the Bible to find either full justification or ample apology for enslaving human beings, are not only giving the lie to their country's Declaration of Independence, and insulting the public mind all reverence for liberty, but covering that volume with infamy, and thus subjecting it to foul opprobrium, and doing what it is their duty to make it detestable in the eyes of mankind; and that these are the great duty of the clergy of the country, (with Moses Stuart, of Andover, at their head,) who are loud in their denunciations of abolitionists as 'infidels' and 'fanatics.'

3. Resolved, That the abolitionists have not only never had any controversy with the Bible as sanctioning any such system of pollution and blood as that of American slavery, but have always found in the strongest denunciations, the most terrible warnings, and the most fearful judgments against injustice, robbery, oppression and cruelty; and these they have cited, and to these they have appealed, with all possible frequency and earnestness.

4. Resolved, nevertheless, that nothing can be more absurd, nothing more precarious, nothing more alarming, than to predicate the rights of man on the existence or permanence of any parchment whatever, which is capable of extinction at any time, or on the authority of which nations may differ—or on the interpretation or teachings of any book, which may be misunderstood or perverted to any extent; for—his rights do not pertain to the being of man, but to his moral, intellectual and physical nature,—then it is a mockery to affirm that he is a moral and accountable being, created 'a little lower than the angels.'

The discussion was continued by Charles List of Boston, Wm. Henry Channing, Abby Kelley Foster, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, and Samuel May, Jr. Adjourned to the afternoon, 1-4 to 3 o'clock.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

At the appointed hour, the Convention was called to order by Edmund Quincy.

Mr. Garrison introduced to the audience a colored woman, formerly a slave named Isabel, now residing

at Northampton, and calling herself *Sophister Truth*. She spoke half an hour, in narrating her experiences of slavery; and though in broken dialect, yet with great power and shrewdness, and most deeply interested the Convention in the story of her wrongs.

LOUISA MOORE of Harwich addressed the Convention with special reference to Mr. Webster.

Wm. C. NELL presented some resolutions passed at a meeting of the colored people of this city in relation to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of this State against their equal right to the benefits of the public schools, and invoking the aid of the members of this Convention in their endeavors to obtain from the Legislature the acknowledgment and secure enjoyment of their rights.

The following Resolutions on this subject were laid before the Convention:

20. Resolved, That this Convention sympathizes with the colored citizens of Boston in their efforts for the equal school rights of their children, and as friends of Justice, Humanity and Education, we pledge to them our active co-operation.

21. Resolved, That in 'the evasions, sophisms, and mere verbal subtleties of the recent decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, which strips the colored citizen of Boston of his clear and undeniable rights in the public schools, we see, with regret, palpable evidence that the cruel and disgraceful prejudice against color, which contaminates almost every thing American, has crept as high as the judicial Bench, and sufficed to cloud the perceptions and distort the views of those who occupy it.

22. Resolved, That though from weight of years and its aristocratic constitution, the Bench of our State may be beyond any direct public influence, we rejoice to remember that the public opinion at whose corrupt bidding it has filed its law is within our reach; and this consideration shall stir us to still more earnest and zealous efforts so to mould that sentiment as to show these chiefs of the law that there is a power in the State still alive and disposed, in spite of their prejudices, to carry out the first line of our Constitution, and make them recognize every man as equal before the law.

The discussion of the general subject was continued by Wm. A. White, of Watertown, James N. Buffum, of Lynn, Parker Pillsbury, S. S. Foster, and H. C. Wright.

On motion of Wendell Phillips, it was *Voted*, That the Convention will now proceed to take the question upon all the resolutions now before them, excepting those relating to Hon. Daniel Webster, and the Decision on the School question.

The other Resolutions were then adopted by the Convention.

Adjourned to meet at 1-4 before 8, in Faneuil Hall.

THURSDAY EVENING.

Faneuil Hall was crowded some time before the hour appointed to commence. At 8 o'clock, the meeting was called to order by Edmund Quincy.

Some introductory remarks were made by the President as to the duty and necessity of maintaining order. No noise, said he, intended to disturb and break up the meeting will be allowed. The city authorities and the abolitionists are agreed in this thing, that Boston shall not be as New York, and that a peaceable meeting of New England citizens shall not be broken up by a lawless mob.

Mr. GARRISON first addressed the Convention, and (with some little exception) was heard with great attention.

PARKER PILLSBURY spoke, amidst much noise, but was enabled to speak many important truths in the hearing of the meeting.

WENDELL PHILLIPS followed in a speech of much wit and sarcasm, during which he was frequently cheered. The rioters present attempted to prevent his being heard, but several of them being removed from the Hall, Mr. Phillips proceeded and finished his speech.

The question on the remaining resolutions being then put to the Convention, they were adopted unanimously.

The Convention then adjourned, *sine die*.

A photographic report of many of the speeches and the proceedings of the Convention was made, and will be published daily.

FRANCIS JACKSON, President.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., Secretary.

ELIZA J. KENNEY, Secretary.

THE ANNIVERSARY.

We congratulate the friends of the slave throughout the country, on the triumphant and enthusiastic manner in which our noble cause was sustained by the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, during its anniversary meetings last week, in this city. No doubt, unusual solicitude was widely felt as to the result, in consequence of the brutal and riotous invasion of similar meetings in New York; but, for the honor of Boston, we are glad to be able to announce that mobocracy does not hold the reins of government in the capital of Massachusetts. And now for a few brief particulars—for our columns are already crowded to overflowing:—

The Meetings.—Nine of them were held successively, continually increasing in numbers and interest to the end. Every other anniversary began and ended, more or less heavily, with a single meeting. Such is the eternal difference that exists between vitality and formality. Of the nine, six were held in the Melodeon, two in Cohasset Hall, and one (the last) in the old Cradle of Liberty.

The Attendance.—The anniversary of the N. E. Convention has always secured a large attendance, but this year it has far exceeded all former demonstrations on the score of numbers. The spacious Melodeon was thronged during the day; Cohasset Hall was crowded to excess during the evening, multitudes being unable to enter; and Faneuil Hall presented as dense a mass and as grand a spectacle as was ever witnessed within its walls, not less than six thousand being present.

The Speeches.—With such able and practiced speakers as Wendell Phillips, Theodore Parker, William H. Channing, Charles C. Burleigh, Adin Ballou, Parker Pillsbury, S. S. and Abby K. Foster, Henry C. Wright, James W. Walker, and William A. White, it is easy for those who were not present to imagine how stirring must have been the sentiments uttered, and how varied the eloquence displayed. All the principal speeches were reported by a skillful photographer, (Dr. Stone), and will be published in the Liberator as rapidly as possible; so that all those who candidly desire to know what was really said and done by the 'fanatical,' 'incendiary,' 'blasphemous' advocates of down-trodden humanity, on that occasion, may here find a correct report.

The Press.—Never before has the daily press of this city descended to such scurrilous attacks and malicious caricatures, in pretending to give a sketch of the proceedings of this Convention. The Herald, Times, Mail, Bee, Mercantile Journal, Courier, Post, tried to excel each other in ridicule, vituperation and blackguardism. In our next number, we shall give some proofs of this.

WEBSTER'S LAST LETTER. The letter of Mr. Webster, on our first page, in reply to his Newburyport endorsers, betrays a mind exasperated and desperate, and assuredly must deepen the infamy which he has invoked upon his memory. He ridicules the idea that a citizen at the North, seized on the alleged ground of being a fugitive slave, should have a jury trial, and regards a man as less valuable than a horse! He seems as anxious to be written down a villain as Dogberry was to be recorded an ass. His wicked and scurrilous accusations against the abolitionists are precisely those which were made by Bennett in his New York Herald to stir up the recent mobs in that city.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

At the appointed hour, the Convention was called to order by Edmund Quincy.

Mr. Garrison introduced to the audience a colored woman, formerly a slave named Isabel, now residing

PLEDGES

Made at the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, in behalf of the One Hundred Conventions; to be paid to the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society.

Weymouth Female Anti-Slavery Society, by Mrs. Hunt, \$25 00

D. S. Whitney, Beverly, 5 00

B. F. Burgess, Boston, 5 00

Francis Jackson, 200 00

Wendell Phillips, 200 00

Charles F. Hovey, 100 00

Reuben H. Over, 5 00

William Shaw, 5 00

Jonas G. Clark, 5 00

Mary G. Chapman, 10 00

Nathaniel Stone, Watertown, 1 00

Thomas H. Jones, 2 00

J. G. Dodge, 1 00

Samuel Philbrick, 100 00

Abner Sanger, 25 00

Bourne Spooner, 20 00

Edmund Jackson, 25 00

H. Farley, Lowell, 1 00

Charles Tucker, 2 00

J. H. Easton, 5 00

J. Abington, friends in, 2 00

Edwin C. Smith, 100 00

Mrs. Smith, Plainfield, Ct., 5 00

DONATIONS

To the New England A. S. Convention, for the Hundred Conventions.

James N. Buffum, Lynn, \$25 00

Elizabeth A. Cotton, Boston, 10 00

Jonas G. Clark, 5 00

Patrick F. Slane, 5 00

Samuel Barrett, Concord, 5 00

Samuel May, Jr., Newburyport, 5 00

William Ashby, Newburyport, 5 00

Elijah Taylor, Blackstone, 5 00

John Dyer, Plymouth, 5 00

Benjamin A. Stevens, Lawrence, 5 00

Ruth H. Morrill, Portland, 5 00

John C. Gore, Roxbury, 5 00

A. Friend, 5 00

M. & E. A. Stowell, Worcester, 2 00

North Bellingham, 75c.—Mr. Bell, 25c.

H. W. Carter, Athol, 1 00

W. H. Wood, 1 00

By Finance Committee, to meet expenses of New England Anti-Slavery Convention, May, 1850.

John Bailey \$1 00

D. Y. Kendall 1 00

J. Russell 1 00

W. B. Elliott 1 00

J. T. Buckingham 1 00

H. W. Blinnard 1 00

Wm. Sparrell 1 00

Miss Fletcher 1 00

C. Broughton 1 00

H. H. Brigham 1 00

Geo. Stanley 1 00

Lewis Hayden 1 00

C. K. Whipple 1 00

B. F. Burgess 1 00

Miss Southwick 1 00

James Bell 1 00

D. S. Whitney 1 00

Samuel Dyer 1 00

Elbridge Sprague 1 00

Francis Jackson 1 00

Samuel May, Jr. 1 00

Alexander Wilson 1 00

E. Y. Perry 1 00

Calvin Fairbank 1 00

S. H. Gay 1 00

W. S. Brown 1 00

E. Quincy 1 00

H. C. Fitch 1 00

I. S. Beans 1 00

D. B. Smith 1 00

Anne W. Weston 1 00

Anna Ford 1 00

H. B. Spooner 1 00

Sarah Holmes 1 00

Wm. Ashby 1 00

Mrs. J. A. Spooner 1 00

R. H. Over 1 00

E. A. Kittredge 1 00

Sarah Ford 1 00

Mrs. M. H. Howard 1 00

Martha Smith 1 00

John M. Spear 1 00

A. M. Chase 1 00

Charles Russell 1 00

Samuel Reed 1 00

R. H. Morrill 1 00

O. J. Lovett 1 00

Sally Batchelder 1 00

Thomas Haskell 1 00

North Bellingham 1 00

A. Fearing, Jr. 1 00

R. C. Pope 1 00

G. W. Rogers 1 00

John Corning 1 00

Wendell Phillips 1 00

Nancy Lovell 1 00

Bourne Spooner 1 00

Merriam 1 00

R. Plummer 1 00

Elias Richards 1 00

Anna White 1 00

H. C. Fitch [2d cont. contribution] 1 00

Mary T. Tidmarsh 1 00

F. M. Robbins 1 00

Martha O. Barrett 1 00

Gertrude Barrett 1 00

Maria S. Page 1 00

Two children 1 00

John P. Andrews 1 00

Edmund Shaw 1 00

Alfred Wymann 1 00

Geo. Studley 1 00

M. M. Brooks 1 00

Joseph Jocelyn 1 00

E. L. Capron 1 00

Wm. Shaw 1 00

Samuel Philbrick 1 00

Sarah T. Dace 1 00

R. S. Edes 1 00

Joseph E. Richmond 1 00

Joseph Merrill 1 00

Eliza W. Williams 1 00

Stephen Baldwin 1 00

A. Stanwood 1 00

W. P. C. 1 00

Henry Ellwell 1 00

S. S. Meers 1 00

Lucius Ford 1 00

Israel H. Brown 1 00

Liberty W. Stone 1 00

H. Thompson 1 00

Wm. Farwell 1 00

Lucy H. Ballou 1 00

Mrs. Godfrey 1 00

Where slavery exists is no religion. (Signed) A. German 1 00

J. Johnson 1 00

Chas. T. Hanson 1 00

John Curtis 1 00

L. M. Cutcheon 1 00

G. W. Hoadley 1 00

Ira F. Lowell 1 00

J. N. Barbour 1 00

G. S. Flint 1 00

Luther Melendy 1 00

Asa Brett 1 00

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

RESOLUTIONS

Passed at a public meeting, held in the Broadmead Rooms, Bristol, England, on Tuesday, April 9, 1850, for the purpose of congratulating Mr. Wm. Wells Brown upon his escape from slavery, and of tendering him sympathy and aid in his efforts to effect the emancipation of his brethren in bondage.

J. B. Eddin, Esq., in the chair.

First Resolution, proposed by W. Tanner, Esq., seconded by Edward Thomas, Esq.:—

That this meeting is desirous of tendering a cordial welcome to Mr. Wm. Wells Brown, and to congratulate him on his escape from slavery, and to congratulate him on his escape from slavery, and to congratulate him on his escape from slavery.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

Pursuant to notice, a meeting was held in the Melodeon, Boston, to consider the importance of holding a Women's Rights Convention.

Paulina Wright Davis, of Providence, called the meeting to order, stated its object, and invited a free expression of opinion. Lucy Stone was appointed Secretary. The importance of holding such a Convention was discussed as fully as the time would allow, by H. C. Wright, Samuel Brooks, Wm. L. Garrison, and Lucy Stone, all concurring in the opinion that the times demand that such a Convention should be held.

Mr. Garrison, on taking the platform, said:—I rise to give my support, however feeble it may be, to the object which is sought to be accomplished by this meeting. I do so all the more cheerfully, not only because this movement is in its infancy, but because it will be sure to encounter popular odium at first, and to subject its advocates to ridicule. It is under just such circumstances that I wish to be identified with every reformer; not that reproach is desirable in itself, but because the last place for me to be seen taking a conspicuous part is that where popularity and applause are sure to follow the effort put forth.

I conceive that the first thing to be done by the women of this country is to demand their political enfranchisement. Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence is this:—'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex—three millions are dehumanised on account of complexion. Why should not women vote at the ballot box? I am not pleading here as one very fond of voting. I am a disfranchised man, not because I do not believe in voting, but because I cannot vote under the United States Constitution, believing it to be unholty, knowing it to be a compromise with slavery. [Lives in the gallery.] Have I not a right to say what I please? I do not ask you to endorse it. I believe it to be so, and therefore you must give me the credit at least of being honest. My premises may be incorrect, but between the premises and the conclusion there is no flaw.

I am just as anxious that women shall be allowed to vote as if I voted every day. I hate the law that disfranchises women. It is not for me or any man dogmatically to judge as to what is or what is not a sinful act, or to say to others you shall not exercise the right to think for yourself.

There is a law of the United States, which says that no colored man shall be enrolled in the militia of this country. Now, I abhor the militia. I believe the whole military system is Satanic. I do not want to see any black man enrolled in it. But I hate that law of Congress proscribing the colored man on account of his color just as I loathe a rattlesnake. It is a proscription which has made that exception. I

WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

Pursuant to notice, a meeting was held in the Melodeon, Boston, to consider the importance of holding a Women's Rights Convention.

Paulina Wright Davis, of Providence, called the meeting to order, stated its object, and invited a free expression of opinion. Lucy Stone was appointed Secretary. The importance of holding such a Convention was discussed as fully as the time would allow, by H. C. Wright, Samuel Brooks, Wm. L. Garrison, and Lucy Stone, all concurring in the opinion that the times demand that such a Convention should be held.

Mr. Garrison, on taking the platform, said:—I rise to give my support, however feeble it may be, to the object which is sought to be accomplished by this meeting. I do so all the more cheerfully, not only because this movement is in its infancy, but because it will be sure to encounter popular odium at first, and to subject its advocates to ridicule. It is under just such circumstances that I wish to be identified with every reformer; not that reproach is desirable in itself, but because the last place for me to be seen taking a conspicuous part is that where popularity and applause are sure to follow the effort put forth.

I conceive that the first thing to be done by the women of this country is to demand their political enfranchisement. Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence is this:—'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex—three millions are dehumanised on account of complexion. Why should not women vote at the ballot box? I am not pleading here as one very fond of voting. I am a disfranchised man, not because I do not believe in voting, but because I cannot vote under the United States Constitution, believing it to be unholty, knowing it to be a compromise with slavery. [Lives in the gallery.] Have I not a right to say what I please? I do not ask you to endorse it. I believe it to be so, and therefore you must give me the credit at least of being honest. My premises may be incorrect, but between the premises and the conclusion there is no flaw.

I am just as anxious that women shall be allowed to vote as if I voted every day. I hate the law that disfranchises women. It is not for me or any man dogmatically to judge as to what is or what is not a sinful act, or to say to others you shall not exercise the right to think for yourself.

There is a law of the United States, which says that no colored man shall be enrolled in the militia of this country. Now, I abhor the militia. I believe the whole military system is Satanic. I do not want to see any black man enrolled in it. But I hate that law of Congress proscribing the colored man on account of his color just as I loathe a rattlesnake. It is a proscription which has made that exception. I

WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

Pursuant to notice, a meeting was held in the Melodeon, Boston, to consider the importance of holding a Women's Rights Convention.

Paulina Wright Davis, of Providence, called the meeting to order, stated its object, and invited a free expression of opinion. Lucy Stone was appointed Secretary. The importance of holding such a Convention was discussed as fully as the time would allow, by H. C. Wright, Samuel Brooks, Wm. L. Garrison, and Lucy Stone, all concurring in the opinion that the times demand that such a Convention should be held.

Mr. Garrison, on taking the platform, said:—I rise to give my support, however feeble it may be, to the object which is sought to be accomplished by this meeting. I do so all the more cheerfully, not only because this movement is in its infancy, but because it will be sure to encounter popular odium at first, and to subject its advocates to ridicule. It is under just such circumstances that I wish to be identified with every reformer; not that reproach is desirable in itself, but because the last place for me to be seen taking a conspicuous part is that where popularity and applause are sure to follow the effort put forth.

I conceive that the first thing to be done by the women of this country is to demand their political enfranchisement. Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence is this:—'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex—three millions are dehumanised on account of complexion. Why should not women vote at the ballot box? I am not pleading here as one very fond of voting. I am a disfranchised man, not because I do not believe in voting, but because I cannot vote under the United States Constitution, believing it to be unholty, knowing it to be a compromise with slavery. [Lives in the gallery.] Have I not a right to say what I please? I do not ask you to endorse it. I believe it to be so, and therefore you must give me the credit at least of being honest. My premises may be incorrect, but between the premises and the conclusion there is no flaw.

I am just as anxious that women shall be allowed to vote as if I voted every day. I hate the law that disfranchises women. It is not for me or any man dogmatically to judge as to what is or what is not a sinful act, or to say to others you shall not exercise the right to think for yourself.

There is a law of the United States, which says that no colored man shall be enrolled in the militia of this country. Now, I abhor the militia. I believe the whole military system is Satanic. I do not want to see any black man enrolled in it. But I hate that law of Congress proscribing the colored man on account of his color just as I loathe a rattlesnake. It is a proscription which has made that exception. I

WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

Pursuant to notice, a meeting was held in the Melodeon, Boston, to consider the importance of holding a Women's Rights Convention.

Paulina Wright Davis, of Providence, called the meeting to order, stated its object, and invited a free expression of opinion. Lucy Stone was appointed Secretary. The importance of holding such a Convention was discussed as fully as the time would allow, by H. C. Wright, Samuel Brooks, Wm. L. Garrison, and Lucy Stone, all concurring in the opinion that the times demand that such a Convention should be held.

Mr. Garrison, on taking the platform, said:—I rise to give my support, however feeble it may be, to the object which is sought to be accomplished by this meeting. I do so all the more cheerfully, not only because this movement is in its infancy, but because it will be sure to encounter popular odium at first, and to subject its advocates to ridicule. It is under just such circumstances that I wish to be identified with every reformer; not that reproach is desirable in itself, but because the last place for me to be seen taking a conspicuous part is that where popularity and applause are sure to follow the effort put forth.

I conceive that the first thing to be done by the women of this country is to demand their political enfranchisement. Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence is this:—'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex—three millions are dehumanised on account of complexion. Why should not women vote at the ballot box? I am not pleading here as one very fond of voting. I am a disfranchised man, not because I do not believe in voting, but because I cannot vote under the United States Constitution, believing it to be unholty, knowing it to be a compromise with slavery. [Lives in the gallery.] Have I not a right to say what I please? I do not ask you to endorse it. I believe it to be so, and therefore you must give me the credit at least of being honest. My premises may be incorrect, but between the premises and the conclusion there is no flaw.

I am just as anxious that women shall be allowed to vote as if I voted every day. I hate the law that disfranchises women. It is not for me or any man dogmatically to judge as to what is or what is not a sinful act, or to say to others you shall not exercise the right to think for yourself.

There is a law of the United States, which says that no colored man shall be enrolled in the militia of this country. Now, I abhor the militia. I believe the whole military system is Satanic. I do not want to see any black man enrolled in it. But I hate that law of Congress proscribing the colored man on account of his color just as I loathe a rattlesnake. It is a proscription which has made that exception. I

WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

Pursuant to notice, a meeting was held in the Melodeon, Boston, to consider the importance of holding a Women's Rights Convention.

Paulina Wright Davis, of Providence, called the meeting to order, stated its object, and invited a free expression of opinion. Lucy Stone was appointed Secretary. The importance of holding such a Convention was discussed as fully as the time would allow, by H. C. Wright, Samuel Brooks, Wm. L. Garrison, and Lucy Stone, all concurring in the opinion that the times demand that such a Convention should be held.

Mr. Garrison, on taking the platform, said:—I rise to give my support, however feeble it may be, to the object which is sought to be accomplished by this meeting. I do so all the more cheerfully, not only because this movement is in its infancy, but because it will be sure to encounter popular odium at first, and to subject its advocates to ridicule. It is under just such circumstances that I wish to be identified with every reformer; not that reproach is desirable in itself, but because the last place for me to be seen taking a conspicuous part is that where popularity and applause are sure to follow the effort put forth.

I conceive that the first thing to be done by the women of this country is to demand their political enfranchisement. Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence is this:—'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex—three millions are dehumanised on account of complexion. Why should not women vote at the ballot box? I am not pleading here as one very fond of voting. I am a disfranchised man, not because I do not believe in voting, but because I cannot vote under the United States Constitution, believing it to be unholty, knowing it to be a compromise with slavery. [Lives in the gallery.] Have I not a right to say what I please? I do not ask you to endorse it. I believe it to be so, and therefore you must give me the credit at least of being honest. My premises may be incorrect, but between the premises and the conclusion there is no flaw.

I am just as anxious that women shall be allowed to vote as if I voted every day. I hate the law that disfranchises women. It is not for me or any man dogmatically to judge as to what is or what is not a sinful act, or to say to others you shall not exercise the right to think for yourself.

There is a law of the United States, which says that no colored man shall be enrolled in the militia of this country. Now, I abhor the militia. I believe the whole military system is Satanic. I do not want to see any black man enrolled in it. But I hate that law of Congress proscribing the colored man on account of his color just as I loathe a rattlesnake. It is a proscription which has made that exception. I

WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

Pursuant to notice, a meeting was held in the Melodeon, Boston, to consider the importance of holding a Women's Rights Convention.

Paulina Wright Davis, of Providence, called the meeting to order, stated its object, and invited a free expression of opinion. Lucy Stone was appointed Secretary. The importance of holding such a Convention was discussed as fully as the time would allow, by H. C. Wright, Samuel Brooks, Wm. L. Garrison, and Lucy Stone, all concurring in the opinion that the times demand that such a Convention should be held.

Mr. Garrison, on taking the platform, said:—I rise to give my support, however feeble it may be, to the object which is sought to be accomplished by this meeting. I do so all the more cheerfully, not only because this movement is in its infancy, but because it will be sure to encounter popular odium at first, and to subject its advocates to ridicule. It is under just such circumstances that I wish to be identified with every reformer; not that reproach is desirable in itself, but because the last place for me to be seen taking a conspicuous part is that where popularity and applause are sure to follow the effort put forth.

I conceive that the first thing to be done by the women of this country is to demand their political enfranchisement. Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence is this:—'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex—three millions are dehumanised on account of complexion. Why should not women vote at the ballot box? I am not pleading here as one very fond of voting. I am a disfranchised man, not because I do not believe in voting, but because I cannot vote under the United States Constitution, believing it to be unholty, knowing it to be a compromise with slavery. [Lives in the gallery.] Have I not a right to say what I please? I do not ask you to endorse it. I believe it to be so, and therefore you must give me the credit at least of being honest. My premises may be incorrect, but between the premises and the conclusion there is no flaw.

I am just as anxious that women shall be allowed to vote as if I voted every day. I hate the law that disfranchises women. It is not for me or any man dogmatically to judge as to what is or what is not a sinful act, or to say to others you shall not exercise the right to think for yourself.

There is a law of the United States, which says that no colored man shall be enrolled in the militia of this country. Now, I abhor the militia. I believe the whole military system is Satanic. I do not want to see any black man enrolled in it. But I hate that law of Congress proscribing the colored man on account of his color just as I loathe a rattlesnake. It is a proscription which has made that exception. I

WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

Pursuant to notice, a meeting was held in the Melodeon, Boston, to consider the importance of holding a Women's Rights Convention.

Paulina Wright Davis, of Providence, called the meeting to order, stated its object, and invited a free expression of opinion. Lucy Stone was appointed Secretary. The importance of holding such a Convention was discussed as fully as the time would allow, by H. C. Wright, Samuel Brooks, Wm. L. Garrison, and Lucy Stone, all concurring in the opinion that the times demand that such a Convention should be held.

Mr. Garrison, on taking the platform, said:—I rise to give my support, however feeble it may be, to the object which is sought to be accomplished by this meeting. I do so all the more cheerfully, not only because this movement is in its infancy, but because it will be sure to encounter popular odium at first, and to subject its advocates to ridicule. It is under just such circumstances that I wish to be identified with every reformer; not that reproach is desirable in itself, but because the last place for me to be seen taking a conspicuous part is that where popularity and applause are sure to follow the effort put forth.

I conceive that the first thing to be done by the women of this country is to demand their political enfranchisement. Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence is this:—'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex—three millions are dehumanised on account of complexion. Why should not women vote at the ballot box? I am not pleading here as one very fond of voting. I am a disfranchised man, not because I do not believe in voting, but because I cannot vote under the United States Constitution, believing it to be unholty, knowing it to be a compromise with slavery. [Lives in the gallery.] Have I not a right to say what I please? I do not ask you to endorse it. I believe it to be so, and therefore you must give me the credit at least of being honest. My premises may be incorrect, but between the premises and the conclusion there is no flaw.

I am just as anxious that women shall be allowed to vote as if I voted every day. I hate the law that disfranchises women. It is not for me or any man dogmatically to judge as to what is or what is not a sinful act, or to say to others you shall not exercise the right to think for yourself.

There is a law of the United States, which says that no colored man shall be enrolled in the militia of this country. Now, I abhor the militia. I believe the whole military system is Satanic. I do not want to see any black man enrolled in it. But I hate that law of Congress proscribing the colored man on account of his color just as I loathe a rattlesnake. It is a proscription which has made that exception. I

WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

Pursuant to notice, a meeting was held in the Melodeon, Boston, to consider the importance of holding a Women's Rights Convention.

Paulina Wright Davis, of Providence, called the meeting to order, stated its object, and invited a free expression of opinion. Lucy Stone was appointed Secretary. The importance of holding such a Convention was discussed as fully as the time would allow, by H. C. Wright, Samuel Brooks, Wm. L. Garrison, and Lucy Stone, all concurring in the opinion that the times demand that such a Convention should be held.

Mr. Garrison, on taking the platform, said:—I rise to give my support, however feeble it may be, to the object which is sought to be accomplished by this meeting. I do so all the more cheerfully, not only because this movement is in its infancy, but because it will be sure to encounter popular odium at first, and to subject its advocates to ridicule. It is under just such circumstances that I wish to be identified with every reformer; not that reproach is desirable in itself, but because the last place for me to be seen taking a conspicuous part is that where popularity and applause are sure to follow the effort put forth.

I conceive that the first thing to be done by the women of this country is to demand their political enfranchisement. Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence is this:—'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex—three millions are dehumanised

